

REMARKS

Claims 23-31 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 23, 29 and 30 are amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 23-31 are presented for further prosecution on the merits.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 23-27, 30 and 31 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

In the Final Office Action dated May 17, 2004, Claims 23-27, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arita (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,926) in view of Gasperina (U.S. Patent No. 5,491,781). It is noted that claims 23 and 30 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

In the Final Office Action of May 17, 2004, Arita is cited at col. 11, lines 15-45, col. 20, line 32 to col. 21, line 65, col. 15, line 13 – col. 16, line 54 and the Abstract for allegedly disclosing selecting a button, magnifying only the selected button, and displaying the selected, magnified button, as recited in the claims. Arita is further cited at col. 24, line 44 - col. 25, line 21 in the Advisory Action of November 19, 2004, for allegedly disclosing the same. However, Applicant respectfully submits that these cited portions of Arita contain no disclosure or suggestion of the aforementioned features. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Arita neither discloses nor suggests the aforementioned features at all.

Specifically, at col. 11, lines 15-45, Arita discloses that individual buttons such as “district” of Fig. 3b, for example, are linked to values stored in certain fields of the table

shown in Fig. 2. The individual button “district” of Fig. 3b is linked to “FIELD 1” of the table shown in Fig. 2. If the individual button “district” of Fig. 3b is selected, a button for each value stored in “FIELD 1” of Fig. 2 is automatically generated. “Tokyo,” “Osaka,” and “Aichi” are among the values stored in “FIELD 1” of Fig. 2. Thus, selecting the button “district” of Fig. 3b results in the automatic generation of buttons “Tokyo,” “Osaka,” and “Aichi,” as shown in Fig. 4A. Similarly, the other individual buttons of Fig. 3b, i.e., “store,” “commodity,” and “department,” are linked to “FIELD 2,” “FIELD 3,” and “FIELD 4” of the table of Fig. 2, respectively. Selecting any of the individual buttons of Fig. 3b results in the automatic generation of a button for each of the values stored in the related “FIELD” of the table of Fig. 2, just as selecting the button “district” results in the generation of a button for each value stored in “FIELD 1” of Fig. 2. Selecting an individual button of Fig. 3b does not result in magnification and display of the selected button.

At col. 12, lines 21-63, Arita discloses that if hierarchies of buttons are correlated, selecting a correlated button results in the display of buttons related to the other button class. For example, Arita discloses that selecting the individual buttons “Tokyo,” “Osaka,” and “Aichi” results in the automatic setting of individual buttons designated “commodity A,” “commodity B,” and “commodity C”. Selecting the individual buttons “Tokyo,” “Osaka,” and “Aichi” does not result in magnification and display of the buttons “Tokyo,” “Osaka” and “Aichi”.

At col. 20, line 32 to col. 21, line 65, Arita merely discloses that individual buttons can be selected out of the buttons shown in Fig. 16, in the order shown in Figs. 17-19, and that a history of each sequence of button selections is stored in a “button manipulation

history table” of Fig. 20. Arita does not disclose or suggest that selecting any of the buttons of Fig. 16 results in magnification and display of the selected buttons.

At col. 15, line 13 – col. 16, line 54, Arita discloses that the definition of a new, individual button is created by selecting as many individual buttons as necessary from among existing buttons and then entering a designation, or descriptive name, for the new, individual button. Selecting the new, individual button, once it is created, will produce the same result as selecting all of the individual buttons that were selected when the new, individual button was defined. Selecting the arbitrary buttons from among the existing buttons does not result in the magnification and display of the selected buttons, nor does selecting the new, individual button result in the magnification and display of the new, individual button.

In the Abstract, Arita merely discloses displaying a button group and individual buttons. Arita neither discloses nor suggests selecting a button, magnifying only the selected button and displaying the selected, magnified button.

The Advisory Action mailed on November 19, 2004, cites Arita at col. 24, line 44 to col. 25, line 21 and asserts that “change of display size according to sales” is implemented by selecting a button with the input unit, and that as a result, the button “Tokyo” (for example) is redisplayed with the largest size (since sales were greatest in Tokyo). However, Applicant respectfully submits that selecting a button to implement “change of display size according to sales” so that a button corresponding to the district having the highest sales (e.g., Tokyo) is displayed in a larger size is not the same as selecting a button, magnifying only the selected button, and displaying the selected, magnified button, as recited in independent Claims 23 and 30.

Arita does not disclose selecting the button "Tokyo" and the button "Tokyo" being magnified and displayed as a result of the selection. Rather, Arita discloses selecting some button to execute some code to cause a different button of a group of buttons to be displayed larger than the rest of the group. In contrast, in the claimed invention, it is the selected button, which is magnified and displayed. Thus, Arita fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent Claims 23 and 30.

Gasperina similarly fails to disclose or suggest the above feature of independent Claims 23 and 30. Thus, independent Claims 23 and 30 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Arita and Gasperina. Accordingly, independent Claims 23 and 30 are allowable over the combination of references and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 24-27 and 31 depend from Claims 23 and 30, respectively. Thus, Claims 24-27 and 31 are allowable for the same reasons as Claims 23 and 30, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 28 and 29 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

In the Final Office Action mailed May 17, 2004, Claims 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arita in view of Gasperina and further in view of Schindler (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,390). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 29 is independent and claim 28 depends from claim 23. Claims 23 and 29 recite, in part:

selecting an arbitrary button in said tool bar; and
magnifying only said selected button into a predetermined size
in longitudinal and lateral directions and displaying said
selected, magnified button.

As described above, neither Arita nor Gasperina discloses or suggests the above feature of independent Claims 23 and 29. Schindler similarly fails to disclose this feature, and, as noted in the Advisory Action of November 19, 2004, Schindler is not cited for disclosing this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the art of record, taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests each and every feature of independent Claims 23 and 29. Thus, independent Claims 23 and 29 are believed to be patentably distinct over the combination of references and in condition for allowance.

Claim 28 depends from Claim 23. Thus, Claim 28 is allowable for the same reasons as Claim 23, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 23-31 are patentably distinct over the cited references. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Docket No. 101216-09002.**

Respectfully submitted,

ARENT FOX, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michele L. Connell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michele" and last name "Connell" clearly distinguishable.

Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6104
Facsimile: (202) 857-6395

MLC:sg